

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Han .

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,710	07/25/2003	Costanzo Lorenzotti	001US1	1892
21254	7590 11/02/2005	EXAMINER		
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD			MATZEK, MATTHEW D	
SUITE 200	JOKITIOUSE ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VIENNA, VA	A 22182-3817		1771	· ·

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/626,710	LORENZOTTI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Matthew D. Matzek	1771		

'	Matthew D. Matzek	''''	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NC w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) wided below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-17 and 21-28</u> .			·
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ince because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
		NORCATORRE	S
		PRIMARY EXAMI	NER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Amendment submitted 10/17/2005 includes claims that contain indefinitedness. The 112 rejection of of claim 14 is maintained since page 9, lines 19-21 of the Specification refers to multiple length ranges and the claim is indefinite because it is unclear as to which range is meant to provide the "uniform" length teaching. Further the term "substantially uniform" is not the same as "uniform" rendering the claim indefinite as it is unclear as to what constitutes "substantially". The amended Claim 23 still raises indefinitedness issues since it is unclear to Examiner as to what dimension of the fiber is being claimed. Said dimension is believed to be fineness. The applied prior art teaches the use of cotton staple fibers. The prior art of either teaches the instantly claimed lengths for said fibers or has been evidenced by the Textile Glossary entry that accompanied the Office Action dated 8/3/2005. In both instances the instantly claimed length ranges have been met by the applied references. With regards to arguments regarding the fiber length ranges of the prior art, it is noted herein that the claimed range is encompassed by the prior art of the '821 and '991 references. The Applicants must show unexpected criticality of having their range by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative the prior art 's range.